the Electricity Board and the workers were present. The Commissioner of Labour could not, however, bring about an amicable settlement. He accordingly submitted a report to Government which was received on 5th March 1958.

As a matter of general policy, the Government prefer settlement of disputes by negotiation wherever possible. In this background, taking into account the special position of the Electricity undertaking as an essential public utility service, the conditions of employment, the nature of demands, the desirability of avoiding greater anomalies than are likely to be solved and the need to promote better relations, the Government felt that the dispute could be resolved by a Negotiating Committee in which the parties and the Commissioner of Labour could be associated.

Accordingly the Government proposed to the Madras State Electricity Board and to the workers, the constitution of a Negotiating Committee to conduct negotiations on the demands of the workers and to arrive at an amicable settlement in the matter. The Government have further discussed the matter with the parties and have appointed a Negotiating Committee under the Chairmanship of Sri M. V. Harihara Iyer consisting of the representatives of the Electricity Board and three representatives of the workers.

The Negotiating Committee has been asked to examine the issues relating to the revision of wages, classification and gradation of workers, D.A., Gratuity, Provident Fund, Permanency, etc., and to endeavour to arrive at an amicable settlement. The Committee has been requested to send its final report containing a Memorandum of settlement and/or its recommendations on the issues referred to it, within a period of two months. The Committee has been requested to send its final report containing a ditiously containing its recommendations on the quantum of interim relief, if any, to be granted to the workers.

In conclusion I would like to thank the leaders of the various parties in the Legislature who took an active interest in the matter with a view to preventing a strike by the Electricity Workers, and effecting an amicable settlement.

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* TAMIL-SINHALESE LANGUAGE CONTROVERSY IN CEYLON.

9-30 a.m. MR. SPEAKER: I have received notice of an adjournment motion from three hon. Members, viz., Sri S. B. Adityan, Sri K. Appavu Pillai and Sri T. Velusamy which states—

"We, the undersigned members propose to move a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose

7th April 1958] [Mr. Speaker]

of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely :—

In spite of the unanimous resolution of this Assembly on 13th May 1954 expressing concern over the position of the Tamil people of this State residing in Ceylon and requesting the Government to take suitable steps to prevent further deterioration of the position, a serious situation has developed on account of Tamil-Sinhalese language controversy and Tamil writings being tarred by bad elements in areas occupied by the Tamil people; and the Ceylonese authorities opening fire and killing two Tamilians and seriously injuring three more, all of them being persons belonging to this State and further clashes having occurred, resulting in more loss of lives. The failure of this Government to implement the resolution passed by this Assembly on 13th May 1954, has been the direct cause of the atrocities against the honour of the Tamil people and loss of their lives; and it is absolutely necessary that this Government should take serious notice of the position and make urgent representations to the Government of India to take immediate and effective steps to protect the lives and honour of the Tamil people of Indian origin in Ceylon.''

Before giving my ruling on the admissibility of the adjournment motion, I wish to point out that under rule 41 of the Assembly Rules, a motion for an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made. There are certain considerations which must weigh with the Speaker in allowing or disallowing the adjournment motion. It should involve a matter of urgent and public importance. Secondly, the Government concerned must have the administrative responsibility in the matter that has arisen. So far as the implementation of the resolution of 1954 or the failure of the Government to implement it is concerned, by no stretch of imagination can it be stated that it is a matter of urgent public importance especially when we are in 1958. So, I do not think that a discussion on the failure of the Government to implement that resolution could become a matter of urgent public importance. But, I grant that what is happening in Ceylon may become urgent because of its importance. Anyway, before I give my ruling on the adjournment motion, I must satisfy myself whether the Government have any administrative responsibility in the matter. I should like to hear the Hon. Leader of the House or the Hon. the Home Minister on this point.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, the resolution referred to in the adjournment motion relates to the repatriates from Ceylon and it has nothing to do with the internal happenings in Ceylon, which is a matter concerning two language sections belonging to Ceylon. It will therefore be highly improper either for this House or even for the Parliament to discuss that matter. So, without any further discussion, I would request you to rule the adjournment motion out of order.

[7th April 1958

MR. SPEAKER : Have the Government any administrative responsibility in the matter?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Absolutely nil. Sir. The resolution also does not refer to this aspect. The resolution related to repatriates from Ceylon who are Indian nationals. But, this matter is purely the concern of the Ceylon Government. I therefore request you, Mr. Speaker, to rule it out of order without any further discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : As far as the resolution is concerned, I have already stated that it cannot be urgent after four years of the passing of the resolution and there is no doubt about it. But, I was only trying to know if the Government have any administrative responsibility in regard to this matter. I now understand that the Government have no responsibility in the matter. Therefore, I feel that this House is not competent to discuss it and I rule the adjournment motion out of order.

IV.—PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE FOR THE YEAR 1955–56.

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMY MUDALIAR : Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Appropriation Accounts for the year 1955–56 and the Audit Report 1957, and the Finance Accounts of the Government of Madras for 1955–56.

V.—BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 1958–59—VOTING OF DEMONDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1958–59—*cont.*

DEMAND VII—GENERAL SALES TAX AND OTHER TAX-S AND DUTIES ADMINISTRATION.

MR. SPEAKER : We have got two Demands for consideration to-day. One is Demand VII—General Sales Tax and other Taxes and Duties Administration and Demand X—State Legislature. The time allotted for the discussion of each Demand is two hours. Now, the Hon. the Minister for Industries may move Demand VII.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Speaker, on the recommendations of the Governor, I move—

"That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,40,86,400 under Demand VII—General Sales Tax and other Taxes and Duties Administration."

கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, ஏதோ 12 அல்லது 13 கோடி ரூபாய் வருமானத்தில் $1\frac{1}{2}$ கோடி ரூபாயை சர்க்கார் வசூல் செய்வதற்காக செலவு செய்கிறார்கள் என்ற எண்ணம் ஏற்படாமல் இருக்க ஒறிரண்டு வார்த்தைகளைச் சொல்ல முன் வந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த மான்யக் கோரிக்கைத் தொகையாகிய 1 கோடியே 40 லட்சம் ரூபாயில் 95 லட்சம் ரூபாய் ஸ்தல ஸ்தாபனங்களுக்கு என்டெர்டெயின்மென்ட் வரியில் அவர்களுடைய பங்கு 10-ல் 9 சத